

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,747	/524,747 02/15/2005		Kiyoshi Saito	MAT-8664US	6847
23122	7590	03/09/2006		EXAMINER	
RATNERF P O BOX 98				SCHWARTZ, CH	IRISTOPHER P
		A 19482-0980	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	·			3683	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	Office Action Cumment	10/524,747	SAITO, KIYOSHI				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Christopher P. Schwartz	3683				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEMENTS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DISSIDERS OF THE MAILING DEPTH OF THE MAILING DEPT	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 D	December 2005.					
·	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	s action is non-final.					
3)							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
•							
•	Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
· <u> </u>	☐ Claim(s)is/are allowed. ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
·							
·							
	on Papers						
·	The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
44)[7]	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	(PTO-413) WWW. STATE BERNELLE STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE P				
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) ' No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite				

Art Unit: 3683

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's response filed 12/13/05 has been received and considered. Claims
 1-10 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0768224 ('224) in view of Shaw.

Regarding claim 1 EP '224 shows in figure 6 a device similar to applicants. Note the force sensor assembly at 60. On page 5 it is stated that the spring can have a non-linear spring characteristic.

Lacking is a specific showing of the rotatable connection of the spring to the sensor and the brake arm.

However such a connection is known in the art (and would have been obvious to limit unwanted friction between the end of the spring and the arm and sensor).

The reference to Shaw in figure 4 shows such a connection generally at 11.

It would have been obvious to have modified EP '224, as taught by Shaw, for the reason above.

Regarding claim 2 to provide a protective housing for the spring of EP '224, as taught by Shaw would have been obvious. Note the piston at 45 (travel mechanism) which compresses the spring.

Regarding claims 3-10 these limitations are fairly taught by the combined teachings of the references above and what is known in the art. Although not applied see the well known spring arrangements of Wulff, Tilden and Zuccihini. Note that any one of these spring arrangements could be adapted for use with EP '224 since the EP reference is not specific to the spring arrangement as shown in the several embodiments and as discussed previously.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher P. Schwartz whose telephone number is 571-272-7123. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jim McClellan can be reached on 571-272-6786. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cps 3/3/06